

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

 \mathscr{W}

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/854,648	05/14/2001	Amy J. Donnan	DON0002/US/2	8779
33072	7590 09/02/2003			
KAGAN BINDER, PLLC SUITE 200, MAPLE ISLAND BUILDING 221 MAIN STREET NORTH			EXAMINER	
			SUHOL, DMITRY	
STILLWATER, MN 55082			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3712	10
			DATE MAILED: 09/02/2003	18

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		·	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	0
Advisory Action	09/854,648	DONNAN, AMY J.	
•	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dmitry Suhol	3712	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 08 August 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe	avoid abandonment of this applic (1) a timely filed amendment whic	ation. A proper reply to a	
PERIOD FOR F	REPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAY 706.07(f).	s Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth e later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin AS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF T	ng date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the periodee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the O imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37	d of extension and the corresponding amount of the shortened statutory period for reply ffice later than three months after the ma	ount of the fee. The appropriate exter originally set in the final Office action	nsion : or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 Cl	FR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered			
(a) they raise new issues that would require furt	her consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	,		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or simplifying t	he
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	eling a corresponding number of t	inally rejected claims.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje	ection(s):		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	ld be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendme	nt
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: S	or reconsideration has been cons See Continuation Sheet.	idered but does NOT place the)
 The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	ecause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendme explanation of how the new or amended claims v			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	: :		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 1,4 and 6-18.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed oni	is a) □ approved or b) □ disapp	proved by the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statem	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).		
0. Other:			
	70		
	SUPER	DERRIS H. BANKS /ISORY PATENT EXAMINER INOLOGY CENTER 3700	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 04-01) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants have failed to overcome the rejections as stated in paper number 16. Applicants main arguement appears to focus on applicants assertion that Shaver does not teach "a distinc shape". The examiner points out, as stated in paper no. 6, that applicants claim language states "comprising...a unique shape" in which case each playpiece has a unique shape (i.e. circular). In other words applicants do not make any distinction in the claims that of each playpiece having a distinct and unique shape respective other playpieces. The same reasoning is applied to the argument regarding colo